

1 Martin K. Deniston (State Bar No. 106737)
2 Diana M. Estrada (State Bar No. 212702)
3 **WILSON, ELSE, MOSKOWITZ,
4 EDELMAN & DICKER LLP**
5 555 South Flower Street, Suite 2900
6 Los Angeles, California 90071
7 Telephone: (213) 443-5100
8 Facsimile: (213) 443-5101

9
10 Attorneys for Defendant
11 Coudert Brothers LLP and Defendants identified in Exhibit 1

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414<br

1 James C. Colihan, William K. Coulter, Richard N. Dean, Richard De Palma,
 2 Robert L. Eisen, Joseph Farrell, Kay Georgi, Tara K. Giunta, Kevin W. Goering,
 3 Deborah Goldstein, Michael J. Hagan, Robert E. Hanlon, Gerard V. Hannon,
 4 Andrew Hedden, Janet Hernandez, Stephen M. Hudspeth, W. Michael Kelly,
 5 Frederick P. Konta, George J. Martin, Jr., Brian McGunigle, Barry Metzger, Owen
 6 Nee, Marilyn S. Okoshi, Richard M. Ornitz, Kenneth R. Page, Robert F.
 7 Pietrowski, Jr., Darrell Prescott, Clyde E. Rankin, III, Richard Reilly, Thomas
 8 Rice, Olga Sirodoeva, James B. Sitrick, Roger D. Stark, Edward H. Tillinghast, III,
 9 Charles H. Wagner, Roger B. Wagner, Christopher M. Wells, Anthony Williams,
 10 Mary F. Voce, John M. Gurley, and Carol B. Stubblefield (hereinafter referred to
 11 as "Individual Partner Defendants") will move this Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
 12 §1412, for an Order to transfer this matter to the United States District Court for
 13 the Southern District of New York, the district in which Coudert Brothers LLP's
 14 Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding, entitled In re Coudert Brothers LLP, Case No.
 15 06-12226, is currently pending.

16 This motion is based on the accompanying memorandum in support of the
 17 motion, the declaration of Diana M. Estrada, as well as the pleadings, records, and
 18 files in this action, and any other such documentary or oral evidence which may be
 19 supplied at the hearing.

20
 21 Dated: July 11, 2007

WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ,
 EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

22
 23

24

By:

Martin K. Deniston
 Diana M. Estrada
 Attorneys for Defendant
 COUDERT BROTHERS LLP and
 Defendants identified in Exhibit 1

25
 26
 27

28

1 TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	I. INTRODUCTION	1
2	II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND	1
3	A. Inception of Action and the Parties.....	1
4	B. Coudert Brothers LLP's Bankruptcy and	
5	Automatic Stay	2
6	C. SenoRx's Proof of Claim Filed in the Southern	
7	District of New York.....	3
8	D. Removal to the United States District Court for the	
9	Northern District of California.....	4
10	E. Denial of SenoRx's Motion to Remand	4
11	III. 28 U.S.C. § 1412 AUTHORIZES THIS COURT TO TRANSFER	
12	THIS MATTER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR	
13	THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	6
14	IV. THIS COURT MAY TRANSFER THIS MATTER EITHER IN	
15	THE "INTEREST OF JUSTICE" <u>OR</u> FOR THE "CONVENIENCE	
16	OF THE PARTIES	7
17	V. TRANSFER TO THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
18	IS IN THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE	7
19	A. There is a Presumption in Favor of Transferring this Matter	
20	to the "Home Court" in the Southern District of New York.....	9
21	B. Transferring this Matter to the Southern District of	
22	New York will Promote the Economic and Efficient	
23	Administration of the Bankruptcy Estate.....	10
24	C. California's Interest in Having This Matter Decided Within	
25	Its Borders is Minimal and Far Outweighed by Benefits of	
26	Transfer on the Administration of the Estate	14

1	D. The Ability to Receive a Fair Trial and the Enforceability	
2	of Any Judgment Weigh in Favor of the Transfer of	
3	this Matter.....	14
4	E. SenoRx's Original Choice of Forum Weighs in Favor	
5	of the Transfer of this Matter	15
6	VI. ALTERNATIVELY, CONVENIENCE OF THE PARTIES	
7	SUPPORTS THE TRANSFER OF THIS MATTER TO	
8	THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE	
9	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	15
10	VII. CONCLUSION.....	18
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

1 TABLE OF AUTHORITIES
2
34 Cases
5
6

7 <i>A.B. Real Estate, Inc. v. Bruno's Inc. (In Re: Bruno's, Inc.)</i> 277 B.R. 311, 323 8 (Bankr. N.D. Ala.1998)	9 6
9 <i>A.H. Robins Co., v. Piccinin,</i> 10 788 F.2d 994, 1012 (4th Cir. Va. 1986).....	11 5, 10
12 <i>In re Bruno's, Inc.</i> 13 277 B.R. 311, 324 (Bankr. N.D. Ala.1998).....	14 7, 8, 15, 16
15 <i>In Re Chicago Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R.R. Co.</i> 16 6 F.3d 1184 (7th Cir. 1993).....	17 14
18 <i>In re Cole Associates, Inc.</i> 19 7 B.R. 154, 157 (Bankr. D. Utah 1980).....	20 8
22 <i>In re Commonwealth Oil Refining Company, Inc.,</i> 23 596 F.2d 1239, 1247 (5th Cir. 1979)	24 8
26 <i>In re Cuyahoga Equip. Corp.</i> 27 980 F.2d 110, 117 (2d Cir. 1992).....	28 7
30 <i>Geo. F. Martin Co. v. Royal Ins. Co. of Am.</i> 31 2004 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 8927, at *7 n.3 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2004)	32 17
35 <i>In re G.I. Industries</i> 36 204 F.3d 1276, 1279-80 (9th Cir. Cal.2000)	37 4
39 <i>Gulf States Exploration Co. v. Manville Forest Products Corp. (In re Manville</i> 40 <i>Forest Products Corp.)</i> 41 896 F.2d 1384, 1391 (2d. Cir. 1991)	42 8
45 <i>In re Iridium Operating LLC</i> 46 185 B.R. 822, 835 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002.....	47 6
49 <i>Irwin v. Beloit Corp. (In re Harnischfeger Indus.)</i> 50 246 B.R. 421, 440 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 2000)	51 9

1	<i>Larami Ltd. v. Yes! Entertainment Corp.</i>	
2	244 B.R. 56 (D.N.J. 2000)	16
3	<i>In re Manville Forest Products Corp.</i>	
4	896 F.2d 1384, 1391 (2d Cir. 1990)	8
5	<i>In re Red Ash Coal & Coke Corp.</i>	
6	83 B.R. 399 (1988 W.D. Va.)	12
7	<i>Renaissance Cosmetics, Inc. v. Development Specialists, Inc.</i>	
8	277 B.R. 5, 19-20 (S.D.N.Y. 2002)	18
9	<i>Securities and Exchange Commission v. KPMG, LLP</i>	
10	2003 WL 1842871 (S.D.N.Y. 2003)	7
11	<i>In re Showcase Natural Casing Co.</i>	
12	(54 B.R. 142 (1985 B.C. S.D. Ohio)	12
13	<i>Solomon v. Continental American Life Ins. Co.</i>	
14	472 F.2d 1043, 1047 (3d Cir. N.J. 1973)	17
15	<i>In re TIG Company</i>	
16	264 B.R. 661, 668 (BAnkr. CD. CA 2001)	7
17	<i>In re Toxic Control Technologies</i>	
18	84 B.R. 140 (Bankr. N.D. Ind. 1988)	7
19	<i>Tracy v. Consolidated R. Corp.</i>	
20	723 F. Supp. 1051, 1053 (D. Del. 1989)	17
21	<u>Statutes</u>	
22	Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1)	4
23	Bankruptcy Rule 9027(a)	4
24	California Corporations Code § 16956	3
25	11 U.S.C. § 362	11
26	11 U.S.C. § 362(a)	3
27	28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)	4

1	28 U.S.C. § 157(c).....	11
2	28 U.S.C. § 1334	4, 11
3	28 U.S.C. § 1404	6
4	28 U.S.C. § 1412	1, 6, 7
5	28 U.S.C. § 1452.....	4, 12
6		
7		
8	<u>Treatises</u>	
9	1 <i>Collier on Bankruptcy</i> P4.04[4][b] (15th ed. rev. 2005)	6
10		
11	10 <i>Collier on Bankruptcy</i> Chapter 7087 <i>Transfer of Adversary Proceeding</i> P 7087.02 (15 th ed. rev 2005).....	8, 16
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

MEMORANDA OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

I. INTRODUCTION

This Court should grant Defendants' motion to transfer this matter to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the court where Coudert Brothers LLP's bankruptcy is pending because SenoRx has consented to the jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Court by virtue of filing its proof of claim in the United States Bankruptcy Court in the Southern District of New York, thus making this matter a core bankruptcy proceeding. Moreover, localizing the litigation of this instant matter in that court will promote the economic and efficient administration of the bankruptcy estate. Accordingly, for the reasons stated herein, venue of this proceeding properly lies in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1412.

II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND

A. Inception of Action and the Parties:

On October 27, 2004, Plaintiff SenoRx, Inc. commenced this action for legal malpractice in the Superior Court of the State of California for the County of San Francisco, captioned *SenoRx, Inc. vs. Coudert Brothers, LLP, and Does 1-500*, CGC 04435849. The legal malpractice action arises from Coudert Brothers LLP's alleged failure to timely render legal services relating to the filing of foreign patent applications for SenoRx. The original Complaint was filed by Plaintiff SenoRx on October 27, 2004. On November 3, 2005, and on January 25, 2006, SenoRx filed

1 Doe amendments with respect to the Complaint for purposes of substituting
 2 specifically named individual defendants for fictitiously named defendants. On
 3 those dates, SenoRx named Doe defendants, including the Individual Partner
 4 Defendants, who have appeared in this action, who are former limited liability
 5 partners of Coudert Brothers LLP. None of the appearing Individual Partner
 6 Defendants are California residents or rendered any services to SenoRx and
 7 notably, SenoRx has only served the named Doe defendants that reside on the East
 8 Coast (e.g., New York, Connecticut, Maryland, Washington, D.C., etc.). None of
 9 the other Doe defendants have ever been served.
 10
 11

12 In March 2006, a demurrer was filed on behalf of the Individual Partner
 13 Defendants, arguing that the partners of a limited liability partnership who were
 14 not involved in the provision of services to SenoRx have no vicarious liability for
 15 the liabilities of the partnership with respect to such services. The court sustained
 16 this demurrer, and sustained three subsequent demurrs on the same grounds, each
 17 time giving SenoRx leave to amend its complaint. In addition, at the hearing on
 18 the first demurrer the state court ordered all discovery proceedings stayed pending
 19 resolution of all pleading issues.
 20
 21

22 **B. Coudert Brothers LLP's Bankruptcy and Automatic Stay:**

23 On September 22, 2006, Coudert Brothers LLP filed a Chapter 11
 24 Bankruptcy Petition, in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern
 25 District of New York entitled In re Coudert Brothers LLP, Case No. 06-12226.
 26
 27

1 Accordingly, at that time this matter was automatically stayed as to Coudert
2 Brothers LLP pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 362(a). The stay as to Coudert Brothers
3 LLP remains in effect to this day. Thereafter, SenoRx filed a Fourth Amended
4 Complaint on November 8, 2006. The Individual Partner Defendants demurred to
5 the Fourth Amended Complaint. On January 23, 2007, the San Francisco County
6 Superior Court overruled the Individual Partner Defendants' demurrer to the
7 Fourth Amended Complaint because the court ruled it would need to consider facts
8 outside of the 4-corners of the Fourth Amended Complaint (which would be a task
9 beyond the scope of a demurrer) in order to determine California Corporations
10 Code § 16956's applicability in the context of this case which the court noted was
11 more appropriate in the context of a summary judgment motion and accordingly
12 invited such a motion to be filed at some point in the future.
13
14

15 **C. SenoRx's Proof of Claim Filed in the Southern District of New
16 York:**

17 On January 31, 2007, SenoRx filed a proof of claim in Coudert Brothers
18 LLP's bankruptcy case. A true and correct copy of the Proof of Claim filed by
19 SenoRx is attached to the declaration of Diana M. Estrada as Exhibit "A." The
20 recovery in that proof of claim mirrors the recovery sought in this action.
21
22

23 ///
24
25 ///
26
27 ///
28

D. Removal to the United States District Court for the Northern District of California:

Pursuant to Bankruptcy Rule 9006(b)(1), the time within which Civil Actions may be removed under 28 U.S.C. § 1452 and Bankruptcy Rule 9027(a) was extended by 90 days, through and including March 21, 2007, by United States Bankruptcy Judge Robert D. Drain of the Southern District of New York.

On February 21, 2007, this action was removed pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. Sections 1452 and 1334 and Bankruptcy Rule 9027. The removal was filed in light of the fact that SenoRx filed a \$25,000,000 plus proof of claim on January 31, 2007, with the bankruptcy court in the Southern District of New York. By doing so, SenoRx consented to the jurisdiction of the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York.

E. Denial of SeroRx's Motion to Remand:

Although SenoRx sought to have this matter remanded back to state court, this Court issued an Order on May 24, 2007, denying SenoRx's motion to remand, noting, among other things, that the proof of claim filed by SenoRx in the Southern District of New York concerned the same transactions as this case and as a result, is a core bankruptcy matter subject to jurisdiction of the bankruptcy court. "The filing of a proof of claim is the prototypical situation involving the 'allowance or disallowance of claims against the estate,' a core proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2)." *In re G.I. Industries*, 204 F.3d 1276, 1279-80 (9th Cir. Cal. 2000).

1 Noting that the Individual Partner Defendants have been named as alleged
 2 guarantors of the firm's liabilities in this case to the extent that Coudert Brothers
 3 LLP does not satisfy the self-insured-retention under the insurance policy
 4 applicable to this case, this Court concluded that the claims against the Individual
 5 Partner Defendants are related to the bankruptcy case because the outcome of any
 6 proceeding against them would have an effect on the Coudert Brothers LLP's
 7 bankruptcy estate. Moreover, any action against the Individual Partner Defendants
 8 will necessarily first require a determination of the liability, if any, of Coudert
 9 Brothers LLP before addressing any potential liability of the Individual Partner
 10 Defendants and the sufficiency of any applicable insurance if liability is
 11 established. Accordingly, this Court agreed that SenoRx's claims against the non-
 12 debtor Individual Partner Defendants are inextricably linked to its claims against
 13 the debtor, Coudert Brothers LLP.

14 In addition, this Court further noted that the large amount of money at stake
 15 in this litigation has the potential to greatly reduce the bankruptcy estate and
 16 constitutes a significant potential liability for the debtor. The estimation of such
 17 liabilities is a "mandatory obligation of the bankruptcy court" *A.H. Robbins Co. v.*
 18 *Piccinin*, 788 F.2d 994, 1012 (4th Cir. 1986). For these reasons, among others,
 19 SenoRx's motion to remand this matter back to state court was denied.

20 By denying SenoRx's motion to remand, this Court confirmed that this
 21 matter was properly removed by the debtor Coudert Brothers LLP, joined by the

1 Individual Partner Defendants, to the United States District Court as a necessary
 2 first step in having it transferred to the United States District Court for the
 3 Southern District of New York, the court where Coudert Brothers LLP's
 4 bankruptcy is currently pending. Therefore, debtor Coudert Brothers LLP, joined
 5 by the Individual Partner Defendants, now move to have this matter transferred to
 6 the court wherein Coudert Brothers LLP's bankruptcy case is currently pending.
 7

9 **III. 28 U.S.C. § 1412 AUTHORIZES THIS COURT TO TRANSFER THIS**
 10 **MATTER TO THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE**
 11 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK.**

13 "28 U.S.C. § 1412 is the applicable change of venue statute for determining
 14 whether a transfer of proceedings related to the bankruptcy case is appropriate."
 15 (*A.B. Real Estate, Inc. v. Bruno's Inc. (In Re: Bruno's, Inc.)* 277 B.R. 311, 323
 16 (Bankr. N.D. Ala.1998).) Moreover, "[w]here a party seeks to transfer venue for a
 17 core proceeding, the applicable statue is [also] 28 U.S.C. § 1412." (*In re Iridium*
 18 *Operating LLC*, 185 B.R. 822, 835 (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. 2002); *See also* 1 *Collier on*
 19 *Bankruptcy* P4.04[4][b] (15th ed. rev. 2005) (noting that §1412 is the applicable
 20 statute for change of venue regarding bankruptcy proceedings because, unlike §
 21 1404, § 1412 does not require that the district court to which the movant seeks
 22 transfer must be a district court in which the proceeding could initially have been
 23 brought.). As such, 28 U.S.C. § 1412 is the appropriate vehicle by which this Court
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 may issue an order transferring this matter to the United States District Court for the
 2 Southern District of New York.
 3

4 **IV. THIS COURT MAY TRANSFER THIS MATTER EITHER IN THE**
 5 **“INTEREST OF JUSTICE OR FOR THE “CONVENIENCE OF THE**
 6 **PARTIES.”**

7 28 U.S.C. § 1412 provides that a district court may transfer a case or
 8 proceeding to a district court for another federal district, "in the interest of justice
 9 or for the convenience of the parties." Because the criteria under § 1412 are
 10 phrased in the disjunctive, the case or proceeding is transferable upon a sufficient
 11 showing of either the interest of justice or for the convenience of the parties. (*In re*
 12 *Toxic Control Technologies, Inc.*, 84 B.R. 140 (Bankr. N.D. Ind. 1988).) Transfer
 13 of venue under § 1412 requires a case-by-case analysis that is subject to broad
 14 discretion of the court. (*In re TIG Company*, 264 B.R. 661, 668 (Bankr. CD. CA
 15 2001).)

16 **V. TRANSFER TO THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK IS IN**
 17 **THE INTEREST OF JUSTICE.**

18 The "interest of justice" ground is a broad and flexible standard which must
 19 be applied on a case-by-case basis and is subject to the broad discretion of the
 20 court to grant or deny motions to transfer. *In re Bruno's, Inc.* 227 B.R. 311, 324
 21 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 1998); *Securities and Exchange Commission v. KPMG, LLP*,
 22 2003 WL 1842871 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (quoting *In re Cuyahoga Equip. Corp.*, 980
 23

1 F.2d 110, 117 (2d Cir. 1992) (additional citation omitted)); *see also In re Manville*
 2 *Forest Products Corp.*, 896 F.2d 1384, 1391 (2d Cir. 1990). There are several
 3 relevant factors that courts consider when making the determination whether the
 4 interest of justice or convenience of the parties warrants a change in venue. When
 5 motions to transfer venue are filed in the "outpost court" (i.e., as opposed to the
 6 local court, in which the bankruptcy case is pending), courts have considered a
 7 variety of factors in evaluating "the interest of justice," including: (a) the
 8 economics of estate administration, (b) the presumption in favor of the local court,
 9 (c) judicial efficiency, (d) the ability to receive a fair trial, (e) the state's interest in
 10 having local controversies decided within its borders, by those familiar with its
 11 laws, (f) enforceability of any judgment rendered, and (g) plaintiff's original choice
 12 of forum. (*In re Bruno's, Inc.* *supra*. at 324-325; 10 *Collier on Bankruptcy*
 13 Chapter 7087 *Transfer of Adversary Proceeding* P 7087.02 (15th ed. rev. 2005)
 14 (citations omitted).)

19 The most important of all the relevant factors is generally recognized to be
 20 whether the transfer of the proceeding would promote the economic and efficient
 21 administration of the bankruptcy estate. (*Gulf States Exploration Co. v. Manville*
 22 *Forest Products Corp.* (*In re Manville Forest Products Corp.*) 896 F.2d 1384,
 23 1391 (2d. Cir. 1991); *See also e.g., In re Commonwealth Oil Refining Company,*
 24 *Inc.*, 596 F.2d 1239, 1247 (5th Cir. 1979); *In re Cole Associates, Inc.*, 7 B.R. 154,
 25 157 (Bankr. D. Utah 1980) ("If one factor be singled out as having the most logical

importance, it would be whether a transfer would promote the efficient economic administration of the estate”).

A. There is a Presumption in Favor of Transferring this Matter to the “Home Court” in The Southern District of New York.

It is because the most important of all relevant factors is generally recognized to be whether the transfer of the proceeding would promote the economic and efficient administration of the bankruptcy estate that there is a presumption in favor of transferring all adversary proceedings related to a bankruptcy case to the location of the pending bankruptcy case. The Court in *Irwin v. Beloit Corp.* (*In re Harnischfeger Indus.*, 246 B.R. 421, 440 (Bankr. N.D. Ala. 2000).) stated that “...the home court, presumption was created to facilitate an economic and efficient administration of the debtor’s estate...” and that “a majority of the courts that have considered whether change of venue is appropriate have created a presumption that the bankruptcy court in which the debtor’s case is pending, the home court, is the proper venue for adjudicating all proceedings in the case, including state actions removed to a bankruptcy court in which the debtor’s case is not pending (referred to as the ‘conduit court’ or ‘outpost’ court).” (*Id.* at 439.) In addition to this presumption, an analysis of the interest of justice factors likewise supports transferring this matter to the Southern District of New York as the appropriate venue for this proceeding.

111

B. Transferring this Matter to the Southern District of New York will Promote the Economic and Efficient Administration of the Bankruptcy Estate.

Transferring this matter to the Southern District of New York will promote the economic and efficient administration of the bankruptcy estate. Given the nature and extent of the relief that SenoRx is seeking, as evidenced by the \$25 million plus proof of claim filed by SenoRx with the bankruptcy court, the resolution of this case will have a significant effect on the bankruptcy estate as the large amount of money at stake in this litigation has the potential to greatly reduce the bankruptcy estate and constitutes a significant potential liability for the debtor. The determination of such liabilities is “a mandatory obligation of the bankruptcy court.” *A.H Robins Co. v. Piccinin*, 788 F.2d 994, 1012 (4th Cir. 1986). As such, the determination of liability by any other court would interfere with the inherent function of the bankruptcy court to determine the extent of Coudert Brothers LLP’s liability in this action. Such interference may cause delay in the preparation or filing of a plan and/or delay the confirmation of a Chapter 11 Plan.

In addition, the administration of the bankruptcy estate will be affected by litigation against the Individual Partner Defendants. As the Individual Partner Defendants had no involvement in the alleged malpractice and rendered no services to SenoRx, the Fourth Amended Complaint against the Individual Partner Defendants alleges that the Individual Partner Defendants are “guarantors” of any judgment

1 obtained against Coudert Brothers LLP to the extent of Coudert Brothers LLP's self-
 2 insured-retention under the insurance policy applicable to this case if Coudert Brothers
 3 LLP does not satisfy the self-insured-retention. Thus, until there is: (1) a finding of
 4 liability against Coudert Brothers LLP, (2) a judgment against Coudert Brothers
 5 LLP, and (3) a showing that the Coudert Brothers LLP bankrupt estate cannot
 6 satisfy or discharge that judgment, the action cannot proceed against the Individual
 7 Partner Defendants as any alleged liability they may have is derivative of Coudert
 8 Brothers LLP's alleged liability. All of these three perquisites are better and more
 9 efficiently adjudicated in the court where the bankruptcy case is pending.

10 This matter is currently stayed as to Coudert Brothers LLP pursuant to 11
 11 U.S.C. §362. Accordingly, the transfer of this matter to the local court would
 12 facilitate the administration of the estate by allowing for both a determination of
 13 the liability of Coudert Brothers LLP as well as a determination of the liability of
 14 the Individual Partner Defendants in a timelier fashion than may be made in the
 15 Northern District of California in light of the current stay.

16 Moreover, the transfer would also facilitate the preparation and confirmation
 17 of a Chapter 11 Plan because any holding of liability against the Individual Partner
 18 Defendants will affect the valuation of the bankruptcy estate. Indeed, the
 19 bankruptcy court has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1334 to hear adversary
 20 proceedings against alleged guarantors of Chapter 11 debtor's debt, which are
 21 related proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 157(c) because a holding of liability against

1 the Individual Partner Defendants gives rise to indemnity claims by the Individual
 2 Partner Defendants against the Coudert Brothers LLP bankruptcy estate; thus,
 3 negatively impacting the bankruptcy estate, as it will have to pay legal fees to defend
 4 itself, thus potentially depleting the estate and any insurance policies belonging to
 5 the estate. This will interfere with the administration of the estate. Therefore, this
 6 matter should be transferred to the Southern District of New York so that matters
 7 affecting the bankruptcy estate will be dealt with by the local court that is
 8 administering the estate.

12 Furthermore, transferring this matter promotes judicial economy as it prevents
 13 the bifurcation of a single claim, which is not capable of being severed. Because
 14 SenoRx seeks to redress a single wrong in its single cause of action against both the
 15 alleged guarantors (i.e., the Individual Partner Defendants) and the debtor (Coudert
 16 Brothers LLP), the claim is rendered a single claim under 28 U.S.C. §1452 and not
 17 separate and distinct claims capable of being severed. (*In re Red Ash Coal & Coke*
 18 Corp.

83 B.R. 399 (1988 W.D. Va.)

Indeed, this is yet another reason why this
 20 matter is proper in the local court of the bankruptcy estate where all matters can be
 21 decided during a single proceeding cutting down on significant cost and complexity
 22 and promoting judicial economy.

25 Additionally, SenoRx's suit against the Individual Partner Defendants could
 26 also detrimentally impact the administration of debtor Coudert Brothers LLP's estate
 27 by imposing discovery burdens on the debtor. Again, this action against Coudert

1 Brothers LLP and the Individual Partner Defendants is based on a single cause of
2 action for legal malpractice. Although none of the Individual Partner Defendants
3 named in this lawsuit were in any way involved in this alleged malpractice, they
4 were named defendants as alleged guarantors. That said, the debtor, Coudert
5 Brothers LLP, not the non-debtor Individual Partner Defendants, will bear the brunt
6 of discovery as it will be Coudert Brothers LLP, not the Individual Partner
7 Defendants, to whom discovery will be appropriately directed. Such focus will
8 detract from Coudert Brothers LLP's ability to focus on the administration of the
9 estate.

10 Transferring this proceeding to the Southern District of New York would
11 promote judicial economy and the efficient administration of Coudert Brothers
12 LLP's bankruptcy estate by co-locating in a single forum all claims arising from the
13 alleged legal malpractice of Coudert Brothers LLP, and similarly promote judicial
14 efficiency by requiring only one judge to so familiarize himself with the relevant
15 facts. Considering the fact that the judge in the local court in the Southern District
16 of New York has already taken jurisdiction of the Bankruptcy Case, he is already
17 knowledgeable regarding issues and can thus ensure that this proceeding would be
18 administered more economically and efficiently in the Southern District of New
19 York.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

C. California’s Interest in Having This Matter Decided Within Its Borders is Minimal and Far Outweighed By Benefits of Transfer on the Administration of the Estate.

While SenoRx is located in California and some of the events in question took place in California, the real thrust of this case has to do with the foreign patent applications in Japan, Canada, and Europe, which make up SenoRx's malpractice case against Coudert Brothers LLP. Accordingly, this case will entail an examination of the laws of other countries and a determination of whether SenoRx could obtain patents in these others countries based upon the countries' criteria. Therefore, this matter has little to do with California law. As such, a New York court can address the issues in this case just as easily as a California court. Further, to the extent this case involves a straightforward state law claim of legal malpractice, as this Court noted in its decision denying SenoRx's motion to remand, bankruptcy courts are capable of resolving issues of state law, as the court will be able to do in this case. (*In Re Chicago Milwaukee, St. Paul & Pacific R.R. Co.* 6 F.3d 1184 (7th Cir. 1993) (stating that bankruptcy courts are qualified to resolve issues of state law)).

D. The Ability to Receive a Fair Trial and the Enforceability of Any Judgment Weigh in Favor of the Transfer of this Matter.

There is no reason to suppose that the litigants in this proceeding will not be able to obtain a fair trial in New York, nor any reason to believe they will have any

1 difficulty enforcing any judgment entered in their favor in New York, the state
 2 wherein Coudert Brothers LLP's principal place of business is located. If a
 3 "judgment is obtained against non-debtor defendants [Individual Partner
 4 Defendants], the location of the litigation will not prejudice the collection thereof."
 5 (*In Re Bruno* at 328.) Indeed, the Individual Partner Defendants certainly are not
 6 located in California.

9 **E. SenoRx's Original Choice of Forum Weighs in Favor of the**
 10 **Transfer of this Matter.**

12 Finally, with respect to SenoRx's original choice of forum, where the venue
 13 of a bankruptcy case is proper, the debtor's choice of forum is accorded weight and
 14 deference. (*In Re Bruno supra.* at 328.) Accordingly, as there is no evidence to
 15 suggest that Coudert Brothers LLP's bankruptcy case is not properly venued, in
 16 New York and Coudert Brothers LLP and the Individual Partner Defendants have
 17 established that the other factors weigh in favor of transfer, deference should be
 18 given to the venue of the bankruptcy case.

21 **VI. ALTERNATIVELY, CONVENIENCE OF THE PARTIES SUPPORTS**
 22 **THE TRANSFER OF THIS MATTER TO THE UNITED STATES**
 23 **DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW**
 24 **YORK.**

26 Alternatively, the convenience of the parties also supports transfer of this
 27 proceeding to the Southern District of New York, or at the very least, does not

1 indicate that such transfer would so inconvenience any party as to overcome the
 2 presumption in favor of transfer. In considering "the convenience of the parties,"
 3 courts generally consider: (a) the location of the plaintiff and defendant, (b) ease of
 4 access to necessary proof, (c) convenience of witnesses, (d) availability of
 5 subpoena power for unwilling witnesses, and (e) the expense related to obtaining
 6 witnesses. (*In Re Bruno supra.* at 325; see also *Larami Ltd. v. Yes! Entertainment*

7 Corp., 244 B.R. 56 (D.N.J. 2000).)¹⁰ *Collier on Bankruptcy* Chapter 7087
 8 *Transfer of Adversary Proceeding* P 7087.02 (15th ed. rev. 2005) (citations
 9 omitted).)

10 The fact that SenoRx is a Delaware corporation and Defendant Coudert
 11 Brothers LLP's principal place of business was in New York, where the current
 12 bankruptcy proceeding is pending, makes adjudication of the instant proceeding in
 13 New York more convenient. Moreover, SenoRx itself even alleges in its Fourth
 14 Amended Complaint that the following Individual Partner Defendants "are, and at
 15 all times relevant were, residents of, ...New York...:" Charles E. Aster, Steven H.
 16 Becker, Philippe Bennett, Pamela T. Church, Charles H. Critchlow, Edmund S.
 17 Cohen, Jeffrey E. Cohen, James C. Colihan, Richard De Palma, Robert L. Eisen,
 18 Kevin W. Goering, Deborah Goldstein, Michael J. Hagan, Robert E. Hanlon,
 19 Gerard V. Hannon, Andrew Hedden, Stephen M. Hudspeth, W. Michael Kelly,
 20 Frederick P. Konta, George J. Martin, Jr., Brian McGunigle, Barry Metzger,
 21 Marilyn S. Okoshi, Richard M. Ornitz, Kenneth R. Page, Darrell Prescott, Clyde E.

1 Rankin, III, Richard Reilly, Thomas Rice, James B. Sitrick, Edward H. Tillinghast,
 2 III, Mary F. Voce, Charles H. Wagner, Christopher M. Wells, Carol B.
 3 Stubblefield, and Anthony Williams. (Fourth Amended Complaint ¶8.) Assuming
 4 that allegation is true, counting Coudert Brothers LLP, 37 out of the 49 appearing
 5 defendants are located in New York. The remaining 12 appearing defendants in
 6 this case reside and/or practice in Connecticut, Maryland and/or the District of
 7 Columbia. Based on that locality it is much more convenient for them to travel to
 8 the Southern District of New York than to the Northern District of California.
 9 Therefore, the transfer of this proceeding to the Southern District of New York will
 10 not inconvenience the parties and witnesses. If anything, it will be more convenient.
 11

12 Defendants are not aware of any facts, nor any documents of any magnitude,
 13 of which SenoRx is not already in possession, located in this or any other state
 14 besides New York, where Coudert Brothers LLP was headquartered. Finally, any
 15 Article III district judge, exercises nationwide subpoena power identical to this
 16 Court.
 17

18 The fact that SenoRx's lawyers are in California is irrelevant. Numerous
 19 cases reject the notion that convenience of counsel is a legitimate concern even for a
 20 transfer motion. (*See, e.g., Solomon v. Continental American Life Ins. Co.*, 472 F.2d
 21 1043, 1047 (3d Cir. N.J. 1973); *Tracy v. Consolidated R. Corp.*, 723 F. Supp. 1051,
 22 1053 (D. Del. 1989); *Geo. F. Martin Co. v. Royal Ins. Co. of Am.*, 2004 U.S. Dist.
 23 LEXIS 8927, at *7 n.3 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2004).
 24

1 The pending action is not a lawsuit between two California residents, but one
 2 with parties mostly on the East Coast. SenoRx will in no way be prejudiced by
 3 litigating the pending action in the United States District Court for the Southern
 4 District of New York. (*See, e.g., Renaissance Cosmetics, Inc. v. Development*
 5 *Specialists, Inc.*, 277 B.R. 5, 19-20 (S.D.N.Y. 2002) (denying debtor's attempt to
 6 remand action to state court in part because conveniences of modern travel and
 7 communication technology have made it more difficult to argue that litigating in a
 8 particular forum is inconvenient for the parties and witnesses)). Therefore, there will
 9 be no prejudice to SenoRx in this regard.

10 As established by the foregoing, transferring this matter to the Southern
 11 District of New York is not only supported by the interest of justice ground but also
 12 by the convenience of the parties ground. As such, this matter should be transferred
 13 to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York.

14 **VII. CONCLUSION**

15 This court has the broad discretion to grant Coudert Brothers LLP's and the
 16 Individual Partner Defendants' Motion to Transfer this matter to the Southern
 17 District of New York either in the interest of justice and/or alternatively for the
 18 convenience of the parties. Therefore, Coudert Brothers LLP and the Individual
 19 Partner Defendants respectfully request that this Court issue an Order to transfer this
 20 matter to the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York,

21 ///

22 ///

1 the district in which Coudert Brothers LLP's Chapter 11 Bankruptcy proceeding is
2 currently pending.

3

4 Dated: July 11, 2007

5 WILSON, ELSER, MOSKOWITZ,
6 EDELMAN & DICKER LLP

7

8 By: _____ /s/
9

10 Martin K. Deniston
11 Diana M. Estrada
12 Attorneys for Defendant
13 COUDERT BROTHERS LLP and
14 Defendants identified in Exhibit 1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

EXHIBIT 1
Case No.: C 07-01075 SC

5 Charles E. Aster,
6 Steven H. Becker,
7 Pamela T. Church,
8 Charles H. Critchlow,
9 Edmund S. Cohen,
10 Jeffrey E. Cohen,
11 James C. Colihan,
12 William K. Coulter,
13 Richard N. Dean,
14 Richard De Palma,
15 Robert L. Eisen,
16 Joseph Farrell,
17 Kay Georgi,
18 Tara K. Giunta,
19 Kevin W. Goering,
20 Deborah Goldstein,
21 John M. Gurley,
22 Michael J. Hagan,
23 Robert E. Hanlon,
24 Gerard V. Hannon,
25 Andrew Hedden,
26 Janet Hernandez,
27 Stephen M. Hudspeth,
28 W. Michael Kelly,
29 Frederick P. Konta,
30 George J. Martin, Jr.,
31 Edwin S. Matthews, Jr.,
32 Brian McGunigle,
33 Barry Metzger,
34 Owen Nee,
35 Marilyn S. Okoshi,
36 Richard M. Ornitz,
37 Kenneth R. Page,
38 Robert F. Pietrowski, Jr.

Darrell Prescott,
Clyde E. Rankin, III,
Richard Reilly,
Thomas Rice,
Olga Sirodoeva,
James B. Sitrick,
Roger D. Stark,
Carol B. Stubblefield
Edward H. Tillinghast, III,
Mary F. Voce,
Charles H. Wagner,
Roger B. Wagner,
Christopher M. Wells,
Anthony Williams,
Philippe Bennet

1
2
3
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE4
5
6
STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES7
8
9
10
11
12
I am employed in the County of Los Angeles, State of California, by WILSON, ELSER,
MOSKOWITZ, EDELMAN & DICKER and am over the age of 18 and not a party to the
within action. My business address is 555 South Flower Street, Suite 2900, Los Angles, CA
90071.13
14
15
16
17
18
On July 11, 2007, I served the DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF AND MOTION TO
TRANSFER VENUE PURSUANT TO 28 U.S.C. §1412 on the interested parties in this action
by email to dweiss@mjplaw.net [Geraldine Weiss] and mpiuze@mjplaw.net [Michael J. Piuze]
and by placing XX a true copy ____ the original thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope
addressed as follows:

19 20 21 22 23 Law Offices of Michael J. Piuze	24 25 26 27 28 Attorney for Plaintiff
Michael J. Piuze, SBN 51342	Senorx, Inc.
Geraldine Weiss, SBN 168455	
11755 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1170	Ph: 310-312-1102
Los Angeles, California 90025	Fx: 310-473-0708

19
20
21
22
23
[X] **BY OVERNIGHT MAIL** I placed true and correct copies of said document(s) in
sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached service list and caused such envelopes to
be sent by overnight mail via Federal Express.24
25
26
27
28
X **(Federal)** I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this
court at whose direction the service was made.29
30
31
32
33
Executed on **July 11, 2007**, at Los Angeles, California.34
35
36
37
38
Kathleen Spendlove39
40
41
42
/s/